SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 42, 48, and 52.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

Mao (U.S. Pat. No. 6,886,178); Barton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,389); and Stern (U.S. Pat. No. 6,591,247).

Proposed Amendments

None.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

With respect to Mao, Applicant's representative pointed out that Mao is generally directed to integrating HTML content into a digital broadcast network. In particular, the Examiner points to Col. 7, lines 37-41 in Mao as showing "dynamically identifying a script associated with at least one video on a packet switched network" as recited in Claims 42 and 52.

Applicant's representative further argued that Mao does not describe "identifying a script associated with at least one video on a packet switched network" as recited in the Claim 42, but instead describes a reverse process in which a web page URL is extracted from a MPEG data stream. As stated by Mao, "The navigation in the settop provided by the control map **to find a desired web page within the MPEG-2 data stream** is illustrated in Figure 5." Col. 7, lines 36-38 (emphasis added). In contrast, amended Claim 42 provides for "identifying a script associated with at least one video on a packet switched network, wherein the script comprises an executable software program." Thus, the method recited in Claim 42 involves identifying video content within a packet switched network, while the system described in Mao discloses only identifying web page content, (e.g., "find a desired web page within the MPEG-2 data stream") within an video broadcast network data stream.

During the interview, Applicant's representative further pointed out that neither Mao nor Barton disclose a process including a first parsing of an identified script and a second parsing of a container file identified by executing the parsed script as provided in Claim 42. Barton describes a system in which a "parser 401 parses the stream ...." Barton does not disclosure

parsing either an identified script or a container file as recited in Claim 42. Stern also fails to describe a method in which there are two parsing steps.

With respect to Claim 52, Applicant's representative argued that none of the cited references describe "grouping together differently encoded versions of the same content" as recited in the claim. In particular, Applicant's representative pointed out that to the extent, if any, that Barton describes grouping differently encoded content, the content is not the "same content" as provided in Claim 52. Barton describes moving video content, audio content, and private data into an event buffer. However, unlike the method provided in the claims, video content, audio content, and private data cannot be considered "differently encoded versions of the same content."

Results of Interview

The Examiner agreed that Claims 42 and 52 are allowable over the art made of record.

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed on April 10, 2006 has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 36-64 are currently pending in this application. Claims 36-41 are allowed. Claim 42 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the script comprising a software program is an executable software program. This amendment is responsive to a request made by the Examiner and is not intended to be narrowing as Claim 42 already provides for a script that is executable ("executing the parsed script..."). Claims 48-51 and 61-62 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the interview conducted on July 20, 2006, Applicant seeks entry of the offered amendments, and believes that entry of these amendments places the application in condition for allowance. None of the amendments require additional searching. Upon entry of the above described amendments, Claims 36-47, 52-60, and 63-64 will remain.

Discussion of Examiner Interview

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for taking the time to conduct an in-person interview on July 20, 2006 to discuss the pending Office Action as summarized above. As summarized in the SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW section above, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the relevance of Mao, Barton, and Stern, and agreed that the cited references do not teach or suggest each feature recited in independent Claims 42 and 52 for at least the reasons discussed above.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mao, in view of Barton, and further in view of Stern. As was discussed during the interview none of the cited references teach or suggest the feature of "identifying a script associated with at least one video on a packet switched network," nor do the cited references provide for two levels of parsing as recited in the claim.

Claims 43-47 and 59-60 each depend from Claim 42. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore

submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claims, and for other features recited therein.

Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barton, in view of Stern, and further in view of Ottesen (U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,493). As discussed above in the SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW section, none of the cited references teach or suggest at least the feature of "grouping together differently encoded versions of the same content" as recited in the claim.

Claims 53-58 and 63-64 each depend from Claim 52. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claims, and for other features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding final Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 8/9/06

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2816352:080706